

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/664,497	09/16/2003	James M. Okuley	. 42P17870	4690	
8791	7590 07/13/2006		EXAMINER		
	Y SOKOLOFF TAYLO	YACOB	YACOB, SISAY		
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
LOS ANG	LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			2612	
			DATE MAILED: 07/13/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/664,497	OKULEY, JAMES M.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Sisay Yacob	2612				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to a come ABANDONED	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 M</u> 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicated any not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da					

Application/Control Number: 10/664,497 Page 2

Art Unit: 2612

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is in response to applicant's amendment to first non-final

office action, which was filed May 02, 2006.

2 Amendments and arguments to claims 1-14 and new claims 15 and 16 have

been entered and made of record in the application of Okuley "Electronic devices and

systems" filed on September 16, 2003.

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 14 are amended.

Claims 2, 4, 6-13 are the same as originally filed.

New claims 15 and 16 are introduced.

Claims 1-16 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3 Applicant's amendments and arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made.

Application/Control Number: 10/664,497 Page 3

Art Unit: 2612

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5 Claims 6 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US patent of Wang et al., (6,366,453).
- As to claim 6, Wang et al., discloses an electronic system (Item 10 figures 7-9) comprising a pedestal base (Item 14 figures 7-9) that has an enclosure mounted to the pedestal base, a flat panel display disposed within the enclosure (Item 12 figures 7-9), and a housing mounted on the pedestal base behind the display (Item 20 figures 7-9), the housing enclosing a processor-based system (Col. 2, lines 34-63).
- As to claim 16, the system of claim 6, further, Wang et al., discloses wherein the housing is substantially concealed behind the display, the housing enclosing a processor-based system (Col. 2, lines 34-63; See figures 7-9).

Application/Control Number: 10/664,497 Page 4

Art Unit: 2612

Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9 The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

10 Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent Shiga et al., (6,522,283) in view of US patent of McLoone et al., (6,910,818).

As to claim 1, Shiga et al., discloses an input device (Col. 1, lines 1-6-12, 63-67) comprising a housing (See figure 1), a first set of keys accessible on an outer surface of the housing, the first set of keys being associated with media playback control (Col. 3, lines 20-21) and a second set of keys accessible on the outer surface of the housing, the second set of keys being associated with control of a computer operation (Col. 3, lines 12-14, 42-46; Items 321, 322 and 326 of figures 1 and 2). However, Shiga et al., does not expressly disclose wherein the second set of keys includes a key associated with opening a file folder on a computer. McLoone et al., discloses a second set of keys accessible on the outer surface of the housing, the second set of keys being associated with control of a computer operation, wherein the second set of keys includes a key associated with opening a file folder on a computer (Col. 2, lines 60-67; Col. 3, lines 1-8; Col. 4, lines 65-67; See figures 2 and 3).

It would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have a second set of keys being associated with control of a computer operation, wherein the second set of keys includes a key associated with opening a file folder on a computer, as disclosed by McLoone et al., because Shiga et al., discloses set of keys that may be switched between control of an electrical appliance, and operation control of an information processing device (Col. 3, lines 6-21) and McLoone et al., disclose a set of keys associated with control of a computer operation, wherein the set of keys includes a key associated with opening a file folder on a computer.

12 As to claim 2, the input device of claim 1, further, Shiga et al., discloses a third set of keys associated with control of a television (Col. 3, lines 18-20).

Page 6

- 13 As to claim 3, the input device of claim 1, further, McLoone et al., discloses the wherein a second set of keys includes a key associated with opening a file folder containing computer media files on a computer (Col. 2, lines 60-67; Col. 3, lines 1-8; Col. 4, lines 65-67; Col. 5, lines 1-12).
- 14 As to claim 4, the input device of claim 1, further, both Shiga et al., and McLoone et al., disclose the device comprises a keyboard (See figure 1).
- 15 As to claim 5, the input device of claim 1, Shiga et al., discloses the device comprises a hand-held remote control (Col. 1, lines 64-67; Col. 2, lines 4-6).
- 16 Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent of Wang et al. (6,366,453) in view of US patent of Evanicky et al. (6,243,068).
- 17 As to claim 7, the electronic system of claim 6, however, Wang et al., does not expressly discloses a pair of speakers disposed inside the enclosure with one speaker positioned on each side of the display. In the field of flat panel display, Evanicky et al., discloses a pair of speakers that are disposed inside the enclosure with one speaker positioned on each side of the display (See figure 1).

It would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify the electronic system of Wang et al., by incorporating a pair of speakers, as taught by Evanicky et al., in order to have a pair of speakers disposed inside the enclosure with one speaker positioned on each side of the display, because Evanicky et al., discloses a flat panel display that may be used with a variety of electronic devices that incorporates a pair of speakers disposed inside the enclosure with one speaker positioned on each side of the display and one of ordinary skill in the art recognizes having the pare of speakers disposed inside the enclosure with one speaker positioned on each side of the display saves space and improves the audio output distribution quality into the surrounding.

- Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al., in view of Evanicky et al., and further in view of US publication of Herrmann et al., (20020124271).
- As to claim 8, the electronic system of claim 7, however, the combination of Wang et al. and Evanicky et al. does not expressly disclose a subwoofer disposed in the pedestal base. In the field of interactive media terminal, Herrmann et al. discloses a subwoofer disposed in the pedestal base (Page 2, Par. 0017, lines 1-5; Item 262 of figure 2).

It would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify the electronic system of the combination of Wang et al. and

Evanicky et al., by incorporating subwoofer, as taught by Herrmann et al., in order to have an electronic system that has a subwoofer disposed in the pedestal base, because Herrmann et al., discloses a system for a media display that may be used with a variety of electronic devices that incorporates a subwoofer disposed in the pedestal base and one of ordinary skill in the art recognizes having the pare of speakers disposed inside the enclosure with one speaker positioned on each side of the display saves space and improves the audio output distribution quality into the surrounding.

- As to claim 9, the electronic system of claim 7, further, Herrmann et al., discloses a subwoofer disposed in the housing (Page 2, Par. 0019, lines 3-6; Item 292 of figure 2).
- Claims 10, 11 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al., in view of Shiga et al.
- As to claim 10, the system of claim 6, however, Wang et al., does not expressly discloses a wireless input device comprising a second housing, a first set of keys accessible on an outer surface of the second housing, the first set of keys being associated with media playback control and a second set of keys accessible on the outer surface of the second housing, the second set of keys being associated with control of a computer operation. Shiga et al., discloses a wireless input device (Col. 1, lines 1-6-12, 63-67) comprising a housing (See figure 1), a first set of keys accessible

on an outer surface of the second housing, the first set of keys being associated with media playback control (Col. 3, lines 20-21), and a second set of keys accessible on the outer surface of the second housing, the second set of keys being associated with control of a computer operation (Col. 3, lines 12-14, 42-46; Items 321, 322 and 326 of figures 1 and 2).

It would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify the system for an electronic device of Wang et al., by incorporating the wireless input device, as taught by Shiga et al., in order to have a system for an electronic that has a wireless input device comprising a second housing, a first set of keys accessible on an outer surface of the second housing, the first set of keys being associated with media playback control and a second set of keys accessible on the outer surface of the second housing, the second set of keys being associated with control of a computer operation, because Wang et al., discloses a system for an electronic display device that may be used as all-in-one display (Col. 1, lines 18-33) and Shiga et al., discloses a wireless input device that may be used as all-in-one wireless input device for a variety of electronic devices.

As to claim 11, the system of claim 10, further, Shiga et al., discloses the input device further includes a third set of keys associated with control of a television (Col. 3, lines 18-20).

- As to claim 13, the system of claim 10, further, Shiga et al., discloses the device comprises a wireless keyboard (See figure 1).
- As to claim 14, the system of claim 10, further, Shiga et al., discloses the device comprises a hand-held remote control (Col. 1, lines 64-67; Col. 2, lines 4-6).
- Claims 12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al., in view of Shiga et al., and further in view of McLoone et al.
- As to claim 12, the system of claim 10, further, Shiga et al., discloses the input device having a second set of keys for performing input control of an information processing device (Col. 3, lines 12-14, 42-46; Items 321, 322 and 326 of figures 1 and 2). However, the combination of Wang et al., and Shiga et al., does not expressly disclose the second set of keys includes a key associated with opening a file folder on a computer. McLoone et al., discloses an input device having a second set of keys includes a key associated with opening a file folder containing computer media files on a computer (Col. 2, lines 60-67; Col. 3, lines 1-8; Col. 4, lines 65-67; Col. 5, lines 1-12).

It would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have a second set of keys, wherein the second set of keys includes a key associated with opening a file folder on a computer, as disclosed by McLoone et al., because Shiga et al., discloses set of keys that may be switched between control of an electrical appliance, and operation control of an information processing device (Col. 3,

lines 6-21) and McLoone et al., disclose a set of keys associated with control of a computer operation, wherein the set of keys includes a key associated with opening a file folder on a computer.

As to claim 15, the system of claim 12, further, McLoone et al., discloses wherein the second set of keys includes a key associated with opening a file folder containing computer media files on a computer (Col. 2, lines 60-67; Col. 3, lines 1-8; Col. 4, lines 65-67; Col. 5, lines 1-12).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sisay Yacob whose telephone number is (571) 272-8562. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffery A. Hofsass can be reached on (571) 272-2981. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Sisay Yacob

7/5/2006

JEFFERY HOFSASS SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE

ECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600